

## DRAFT MEETING NOTES

### PANTEX PLANT CITIZENS' ADVISORY BOARD

**FIFTH MEETING**  
**WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 31, 1994**  
**HOLIDAY INN**  
**Amarillo, Texas**

### INTRODUCTION

The fifth meeting of the Pantex Plant Citizens' Advisory Board (PPCAB) was held on Wednesday, August 31 at the Holiday Inn. The meeting began at 8:30 a.m. and concluded by 1:00 p.m. Agenda items included: a presentation and discussion of monitoring activities at Pantex; discussion and finalization of sections in the draft PPCAB ground rules; approval of the PPCAB 1995 fiscal year budget; a report from the Co-Chair Subcommittee; and updates. Below please find a brief summarization of each of these discussions.

### ATTENDANCE

PPCAB Members in Attendance: Pamela Allison, Sam Arkaifie, Mavis Belisle, Willie Beverly, Lowell Cranfill, Louise Daniel, Beverly Gattis, Tonya Kleuskens, Coco Medina, Trish Neusch, Patrick Padilla, Denise Price, Guyon Saunders, William Seewald, Alisa Sell, Doris Smith, Jere White, and C.E. Williams.

PPCAB Member not in Attendance: Hermilo Martinez, Jr.

Ex-officio Members in Attendance: Boyd Deaver (Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission), Gerald Johnson (Department of Energy), Roger Mulder (Governor's Office), Joseph Panketh (Texas Natural Resources Conservation Commission), and Tom Williams (Department of Energy).

Ex-officio Members not in Attendance: Gary Baumgarten (Environmental Protection Agency), Sam Goodhope (Office of the Attorney General), and Joseph Martillotti (Bureau of Radiation Control).

PPCAB Resource Members in Attendance: Bruce Campbell

Guests: Ev Avara, Pam Bengel, Paula Breeding, Rebecca Jones, Walt Kelly, and Bret Simpkins. (A number of other DOE staff, contractors, and other guests were in attendance, but did not choose to sign in.)

Facilitators: Diane Sheridan and Kristi Parker, The Keystone Center.



## ATTACHMENTS

In an effort to reduce paper use, attachments referred to in this document are not necessarily included. Copies of attachments are included if they were not distributed at the meeting. Copies are also included for members and ex-officio members who were not in attendance at the meeting. For copies of attachments, please contact The Keystone Center (phone: 303-468-5822, P.O. Box 8606, Keystone, CO 80435) or visit a DOE Reading Room in the Pantex area.

## MONITORING PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

The monitoring discussion began with a presentation by Robert Gray of Battelle Pantex. His presentation was structured to respond to the series of questions and concerns that PPCAB members asked at the July meeting. The overheads from the presentation were sent to all Board members prior to the meeting and can be found in Attachment A. Gray stated that the Department of Energy currently does environmental surveillance of the air, surface water, soil and vegetation, and ground water on and near Pantex property. DOE is planning to expand environmental surveillance to include foodstuffs (such as crops around the plant) and wildlife in 1995. He presented maps noting the locations of the current and proposed sampling in the various media.

Air Currently, Pantex has 17 existing air sampling locations. An additional 17 new sampling locations will be in operation by the end of 1995. In response to questions about how this number of sampling locations compares to the industry standard, Gray noted that Hanford, the DOE site in Washington State, currently has 39 air monitoring locations. The Hanford site is approximately 22 times the size of the Pantex site.

Several board members asked about the unusual pattern of monitor sites east of the plant. Gray and DOE officials provided a number of responses, including

- several monitors were located downwind of Playa 1 in response to a potential tritium release in that area.
- convenience of locating the DOE monitors near State monitors. This allows both monitors to use the same power source and allows for comparison of State and Federal samples.
- it is often difficult to get approval to site monitors off-site of the Pantex property.

DOE officials noted that they may consider moving or eliminating some current air monitors once all of the new monitors are in use. In response to a question, DOE noted that they had investigated using solar power as the energy source for monitors and found it to be very expensive.

In response to Board questions about the added value of siting monitors off of Pantex property, Gray and DOE officials responded that it is important for DOE to know the impact that the plant has on the surrounding community and environment. For example, in theory, the use of high

pipe stacks could result in contamination of areas off the Pantex property without any evidence of problems within the Pantex border. DOE also noted that it is important for Pantex to be able to track any contamination that is coming from outside the plant.

Ground Water DOE currently has 18 sampling locations for ground water. For purposes of comparison, the Hanford site currently has 750 sampling locations.

Soil DOE currently has 49 sampling locations for soil.

Surface Water DOE currently has 29 sampling locations for surface water.

Vegetation DOE currently has 22 sampling location for vegetation.

Siting and Control Criteria Gray reported that siting locations are determined based on: potential points of release, prevailing wind direction, regulatory requirements, and public input. In addition, DOE monitors conditions at the Bushland Station, which is approximately 35 miles west of the Pantex Plant property, for comparison purposes. The choice of Bushland and other control criteria are based on the following factors: presumed to be free of influence, generally upwind, and accessible. Several Board members asked questions about using Bushland as a control site, given that some monitoring results have shown Bushland to have higher levels of radiation than some areas within the plant property. Gray and various DOE officials responded that DOE uses the results from Bushland to look for long term trends and comparisons to results from monitoring at the site. Thus, it is changes in numbers that they track as opposed to the actual numbers. It was also noted that DOE currently uses other control stations in addition to Bushland and is considering adding a new station in Amarillo, Claridon, or Borger. Some Board members noted it is important that the public has confidence in the baseline or control criteria that DOE uses and that many questions have been raised about the appropriateness of using Bushland as a control site.

Monitoring History Gray briefly reviewed the monitoring history at the plant. He noted that the earliest monitoring at the plant occurred around 1962 for water, soil, and vegetation. Air sampling began in 1965. 1971 marked the beginning of the current monitoring program. A variety of sampling efforts have been initiated since then, including a 1994 neighbor sampling program. Board members asked that DOE provide more information at a future meeting regarding the results from past monitoring programs and how they compare to current estimates.

Annual Radiation Dose Gray presented a diagram of annual radiation doses that citizens are estimated to receive from various sources. He noted that, hypothetically, an individual living on the Pantex fenceline in 1993 would have received a maximum additional dose of less than .001 mrem in the given year. For comparison purposes, he noted that the natural external background level for citizens living in Denver, Colorado is 140 mrem per year. The average level for citizens in the Panhandle is 110 mrem per year.

A Board member noted that these numbers must be considered in a cumulative fashion. Thus, the additional mrem from Pantex must be added to the other exposures citizens incur during the year. Several board members asked about what levels of radiation exposure are considered too high. Officials responded that 100 mrem is considered a lethal dose and that health affects begin to show at about 10,000 mrem annually. However, it was noted that these numbers are based on lab studies that are extrapolations from animal studies rather than human studies. Board members requested that DOE provide them more information at another meeting about worker standards for exposure and the average amount of exposure that Pantex worker receives. It was noted that all workers at the plant wear dosimeters, thus providing DOE with accurate information regarding worker exposure.

Quality Assurance and Quality Control Gray discussed how quality assurance includes the development of a plan that documents what and how things get monitored, including a clear articulation of training procedures and the chain-of-custody. Quality control of monitoring includes both internal and external checks on lab equipment and results. Internal checks include the testing that labs do to check their equipment. External checks include DOE sending test samples to labs.

A Board member asked about what happens if a lab repeatedly provides inaccurate results. DOE officials responded that all labs must be certified and that any lab that produces too many results outside of the allowable range, will be audited and may lose its certification. DOE need not wait for a lab to lose its certification. It may simply change labs.

Reporting DOE reports monitoring results in three ways. Occurrence reporting occurs when something unexpected occurs at the plant. Quarterly reports tend to include a large amount of data that is fairly hard for the layperson to interpret. Annual Site Environmental Reports are available by June in the following year and are written for the layperson. PPCAB members were mailed the 1993 report.

A Board member asked how the DOE monitoring program at Pantex compares to other monitoring programs in the world. Gray responded that no other country has programs that match the DOE complex. He noted that many peer review groups at DOE facilities have recommended that DOE cut back on the amount of duplicative monitoring to save money. However, he noted that public involvement usually encourages DOE to install more monitors. Specifically, he noted that Pantex's monitoring program is as good as other DOE monitoring programs, particularly after the program expands to include foodstuffs and wildlife. It was noted that a couple of years ago, the number of jack rabbits on plant grounds was down. Sampling of these animals indicated that the decrease in jack rabbits was due to a hard freeze that year and not due to any type of exposure from the plant.

The DOE presentation and discussion ended with Board members asking for more information regarding the results of monitoring, both historically and currently.

000410

Materials from TNRCC and Texas Department of Health Boyd Deaver, TNRCC, and Joe Panketh, Texas Department of Health, presented written responses to the Board's questions that were developed at the last meeting. In addition, Deaver shared a brochure on Pantex Ambient Air Monitoring Results (October 1992 - June 1994), examples of sampling results, and a graphical analysis of radionuclide comparisons by county and some cities. All of these items from the State agencies are included in Attachment B. Deaver noted that his agency produces quarterly reports that are available in the DOE Reading Rooms. Copies may also be obtained from him. Panketh noted that the Department of Health also produces reports that are sent to DOE and available through him or in DOE Reading Rooms. He noted that the State has 19 toxic monitoring stations total, and that 5 of these stations are in Pantex.

Next Steps for the Monitoring Discussion Sheridan and several Board members suggested options for next steps. At the end of the meeting, time did not permit discussions of these options. The Training and Program Subcommittee will meet by conference call with Sheridan to determine how to proceed.

The options listed are below:

- More discussion on the information distributed.
- Focus on one of the topics discussed in detail
- DOE report back on advice they heard and how they might respond. PPCAB discusses whether to make formal recommendations and/or react to DOE's suggested action.
- Invite an outside speaker to provide an perspective on Pantex monitoring issues.
- Ask PPCAB members who are interested to present their perspectives in more detail.
- Identify issues that DOE, TNRCC, or other agencies need input on and focus on them.
- Put the monitoring discussion in perspective by having speakers address natural resource and cultural resource concerns at the plant. Invite Pam Allison and the plant archaeologist to speak.
- Discuss monitoring program goals and discuss what the Board thinks the goals should be.

#### **BYLAWS DISCUSSION**

The Board reviewed the next draft of the Bylaws presented by the Subcommittee (Attachment C). Discussion focused only on new language to the draft, with the understanding that all previously presented language was acceptable to all members. Below please find a description of the issues discussed.

Socioeconomic Concerns The Board approved the language presented in the draft regarding the purview of the Board, including the new language presented on page 2, lines 30-34. One Board member noted that she would like general information regarding the role of minorities and women at the plant and questioned whether the draft language was too narrowly drawn. Board members agreed that the language would allow Board members to ask general questions that would enlighten any concerns regarding "the health and safety of workers and the public"--such as do people of color working at the plant typically work in more dangerous areas? It was reiterated that this Board was established to work on health, safety, and environmental concerns and that the Board has an obligation to stay focused on these issues. Several members noted the importance of employment issues at the plant, particularly for people of color, but also noted that the Board should not be engaged in discussions regarding individual employee hiring practices or interfere with issues that follow under the purview of the unions. It was also noted that general information regarding the plant could be obtained from DOE outside of the Board efforts.

Several Board members stated that this is an issue of extreme importance to them and that all Board members have an obligation to learn from and respect others' concerns. They noted that, as Board members, they are likely to receive letters from people of color who are concerned about employment issues at Pantex. It was noted that Board members will have both the right and obligation to share these letters with the Board as described in a section of the bylaws. Even though the Board may not choose to act on issues outside of its scope of work or individuals employment concerns, the receipt of such letters will be noted in the minutes to assist the Board in identifying any trends that might emerge.

Preliminary Information The Board agreed to delete the language on page 9, lines 13-15 regarding the Board's obligation to treat as privileged any preliminary information. Some Board members noted that they would be uncomfortable receiving any information that could not be shared with members of their community. Board members agreed to address this issue if and when the circumstance arose, as opposed to developing a generic bylaw at this time.

Written Communication Board members approved the language on page 9, lines 24-27, which states that Board members will share any written communicate that they receive with the full Board. Board members discussed that any letter or materials that is clearly addressed to them as a Board members should be shared.

Decisionmaking Board members approved the language on page 13, line 18, which defines a quorum of the Board as equal to 2/3 of the Board with any fraction thereof requiring a full person. The same "rounding up" process applies to voting (page 16, line 10).

Agenda Setting The Board approved the language on page 17, lines 1-4, which allows the Board to set its own agenda. DOE officials agreed with the language and noted that it did not infer with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) requirements.

Placement of Board Documents The Board agreed to generalize the language on page 17, line 28 to ensure that the documents of the Board are available in locations accessible to the public. The language as written in the draft implied that WTA&MU should be made a DOE Reading Room. Although the Board may chose to address at a later point that additional DOE Reading Room should be established, members agreed that this issue should not be addressed in the bylaws of the Board.

Compensation for Board Service Board members approved the language on page 18, lines 23 and 24, which states that Board members will serve without compensation for their time. It was noted that DOE Headquarters is working to provide payment for some individual board members at other sites, particularly in cases where board service causes financial hardships for those who work on an hourly wage. At this time, no PPCAB board member has requested financial compensation for time served. This issue may be revisited by the Board if a future member requests compensation.

Liability Board members agreed to strike the language regarding liability on page 21, lines 1-8 of the current draft. Board members agreed that this language should be provided to all current or potential Board members, but should not be included in the bylaws. The language provides very limited protection. Board members asked that the Attorney Generals' Office investigate whether the State could provide additional protection.

Conflict of Interest The Board agreed to strike the language regarding refusal put forth in lines 19 through 32 of page 19 and to include the language in lines 34 through 36 of page 19 and lines 1 through 3 of page 20. Several Board members stated that this language was more clear and to the point.

Grievance Members agreed with the broad suggestions found in the meeting notes of the Bylaws Committee and asked them to draft language accordingly.

Ex-Officio Members The Board did not reach consensus on whether additional ex-officio Board members should be added to the Board. The issue under discussion was whether the Board should include one or some combination of the following as ex-officio members: Potter-Randall Emergency Management, Carson County Emergency Management, and/or Division of Emergency Management in the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS). The Subcommittee did not reach consensus on this issue, but did provide a detailed list of the pros and cons of pursuing various alternatives. During the discussion, the Board developed a long list of possible options for proceeding, including:

- Option 1      Make representatives from all three agencies ex-officio members.
- Option 2      Have representatives from all three agencies share a seat.
- Option 3      Request that all three representatives serve in a resource role to the Board. Do not add any ex-officio members.
- Option 4      Request that all three representatives serve in a resource role to the Board. Also,



change the status of the Bureau of Radiation Control and the TNRCC representatives from ex-officio to resource roles.

- Option 5      Add a representative from the *State* office of the Division of Emergency Management, DPS as an ex-officio member only. It was emphasized that this representative would be from the State office and not the local representative of DPS.
- Option 6      Try option 1 for six months and then revisit the issue. If consensus could not be reached by the Board at that time, revert to option 3.
- Option 7      Proceed with no additional ex-officio or resource members for six months and revisit the issue at that time.

A Board member reported that she had talked to representatives of all three agencies to determine their interest in participating in the Board. Dick Edmons of DPS stated that he was agreeable to however the Board wanted to proceed. Jay Roselius, Carson County Judge, stated that just one additional ex-officio seat be added to the Board and that the seat should go to the DPS or Carson County. Walt Kelley, Potter-Randall Emergency Management, stated he had a concern with being obligated to attend all Board meeting. However, he advises the Board against requesting that the three emergency management entities being consider share a seat. He noted that the three entities bring very different skills and specialties to the Board. Roger Mulder explained that the structure of emergency management in Texas is such that one entity has no influence over the others.

The PPCAB operates by consensus and was not able to reach agreement on this issue at this time. It was agreed that the Board would readdress this issue at the next meeting.

Outstanding Bylaw Issues The Board identified three remaining issues regarding the bylaws: grievances, ex-officio member seats, and grounds for dismissing a PPCAB Chair. It was agreed that the Bylaws Subcommittee would incorporate the discussions of the meeting and produce a final draft for the Board to review and approve at the September meeting. The Subcommittee was thanked for all their hard work and diligence in completing this task.

Vacant Board Seat The Nominations and Membership Subcommittee identified three individuals for the Board to consider in filling the Board seat left vacant by Ronnie Payne. Payne recently stepped down as a union representative to the Board when he left the union. The three individuals are: John Blakley, Jr., (b) (6) [REDACTED] The Subcommittee recommended Blakley as their first choice to fill the seat. Since each of the nominees applied to serve on the PPCAB initially, copies of their applications were distributed to all Board members (Attachment D).

The Board decided to table this issue until its bylaws were approved, thus establishing a clear process for replacing members who step down. Board members who would like to review video tapes of the interviews from any of the three proposed candidates should contact The Keystone Center prior to the September Board meeting.



Co-chairs The Co-Chair ad-hoc Subcommittee consisting of Lowell Cranfill, Beverly Gattis, and William Seewald reported on their discussing to select a co-chair. Their findings are summarized in Attachment E. The Subcommittee had planned to ask their two nominees to address the Board, prior to proceeding. Since one of the nominees was not present at the meeting, the Subcommittee agreed to reconsider the issue and report back to the Board at the next meeting.

Several Board members noted a concern with having co-chairs. One Board member expressed a concern that some individuals had been excluded from being considered as the chair. Other questions were raised about how the co-chairs would serve staggered terms. The Subcommittee agreed to consider these issues and also propose steps by which the Board will select chairs during the PPCAB meeting.

DOE Headquarters has scheduled a conference call and meeting in Washington, D.C. for chairs of SSABs. It was agreed that Louise Daniel would participate and represent the PPCAB.

### BUDGET

Members discussed the proposed FY 95 budget (Attachment F) and adopted it with the understanding that there may still be changes in some line items. The indirect costs line item may be reduced since it was based on a greater role for the Office of the Governor than the group now plans. Other items could be reduced in cost now or in the future if the PPCAB chose to have Mason and Hanger provide more services.

The Budget and Finance Subcommittee handed out a list of questions on which they seek input from PPCAB members (Attachment G). The Policy and Personnel Subcommittee asked members to answer the same questions for their purposes also. Once money is available, that committee will begin to carry out their plans, approved at the July meeting.

### UPDATES

- Two remaining subcommittees will meet to begin considering their work. Tonya Kleuskens agreed to organize a meeting of the Community Outreach Subcommittee and Willie Beverly agreed to organize a meeting of the Training and Programs Subcommittee. At the September meeting, the PPCAB will brainstorm input for these two subcommittees. The October board meeting will allot time to consider their plans and recommendations.
- Several PPCAB members expressed concern that the Assistant Secretary of Energy came to Amarillo and made no effort to contact or meet with the PPCAB.
- Gerry Johnson mailed to members prior to the meeting a memorandum of understanding as described in the July meeting notes (Attachment H).

## **NEXT MEETING**

The PPCAB will meet on Tuesday, September 27 from 5:00 - 10:00 p.m. at the Amarillo Association of Realtors, 5601 Enterprise Circle, Amarillo. The starting and ending hours were changed to increase agenda time. Please bring a sack dinner if you wish; no food will be provided.

Agenda items will include the following:

- completion of the bylaws, including grievance language, ex-officio members, and the removal of chair(s)
- replacement of Ronnie Payne
- selection of chair(s) and terms of office
- consideration of how to stagger the terms of PPCAB members in compliance with the bylaws (Keystone to develop a proposal to use as the basis of discussion)
- status of implementation of budget
- status of implementation of plans to hire facilitator and administrative support
- brainstorming of input for Community Outreach Subcommittee and Training and Programs Subcommittee
- presentation and discussion on environmental monitoring at Pantex

242\07\08-004.KLP